



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,400	04/13/2004	Ralph Bauer	1055-A4363	3239
34456	7590	10/27/2009	EXAMINER	
LARSON NEWMAN & ABEL, LLP 5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE SUITE 200 AUSTIN, TX 78730			YOON, TAE H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		1796		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
10/27/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,400	Applicant(s) BAUER ET AL.
	Examiner Tae H. Yoon	Art Unit 1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4,7,10-22,24,26-34 and 55-59 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,4,7,10-22,24,26-34 and 55-59 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/30/09, 8/17/09, 10/9/09.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10-22, 24, 26-34 and 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the coating composition comprising the recited components and amounts thereof in examples, does not reasonably provide enablement for the recited component. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Again, undue experimentation would be needed in order to find out the recited properties for different compositions (components and amounts thereof). The mandatory components recited in the claims are only a polymer in an emulsion (or latex) without any particular polymer and amount thereof and 0.1 to 20.0 wt% of the recited boehmite particles. Thus, a composition comprising 1 wt% of any polymeric latex and 0.1 wt% of the recited boehmite particles falls within scope of the instant claims but such composition would not yield the recited properties and applicant failed to show otherwise.

Applicant asserts that the claims recite a composition and properties associated with the composition and that such properties are part of the scope of the claims. The examiner agrees with applicant's statement that the composition and properties are related to each other, but the recited properties are based on the particular composition having reasonable base properties such as paints used in applicant's new 1.132

declaration, not any polymer emulsion recited in the instant claim, by adding the recited amount of boehmite particles. A polymeric emulsion composition without having reasonable base properties will not yield the recited properties by just adding the recited amount of boehmite particles.

Had applicant shown that a composition comprising 2 wt% of an acrylic polymer emulsion which falls within the scope of the instant claim and 0.1 or 5 wt% of the recited boehmite particles have yielded the instantly recited properties, the examiner's instant position would have been weak, but that is not case here. Applicant also asserts that what is well-known is best omitted, but such assertion has little probative value since it is not known what the claimed polymeric emulsion would encompass. A surface coating solution includes paints, surface protectants and adhesive discussed in specification and it also includes cosmetic, for example. Polymers can be various water soluble and water-dispersible polymers. Applicant's examples show paints with an acrylic binder with high amount of pigment and various other additives which already possess decent values for flow and leveling and sag resistance without the instant boehmite particles. Various binders for paints are known such as acrylic, alkyd, urethane and paints having various properties are also well known such as wall or ceiling paint, flat, semi-gloss, gloss, high sheen and/or low sheen, for example, even without considering amount of the binder and pigment and other additives. Thus, the scope of the claimed composition is not well-known as asserted by applicant.

An addition of 0.1-20 wt% of the recited boehmite particles in any polymeric emulsion with a low concentration alone would not yield the instant properties and such

Art Unit: 1796

properties are dependent on various factors such as various polymers, pigments, surfactants, non-associative thickeners (such as colloidal clay or silica), co-solvents other than water and amounts thereof, to name a few, but such limitations are absent from the instant claims.

Also, applicant has stated that improvements in flow and leveling often comes with a sacrifice to sag resistance and vise-versa at the bottom of page 8 in the new 1.132 declaration, and such statement is the proof that the results are unpredictable which would require undue experimentation.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10-22, 24, 26-34 and 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited values for flow and leveling and sag resistance are indefinite absent the time of measurement since applicant's 1.132 declaration filed on February 10, 2009 shows that such values would change with time (see an example with Catapal D in Table D2). Applicant failed to address the rejection.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10-22, 24, 26-34 and 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Elsik et al (US 5,550,180) and Bugosh (US 2,915,475), and in view of Gemon et al (US 2006/0106129 A1).

Rejection is maintained for reason of record with following response.

1. Bugosh is cited to show the instant aspect ratios and a dimension, not a composition and other properties as asserted by applicant. Also, the instant claims are silent as to the composition of the coatings and paints other than well known polymeric emulsion and the utilization of said polymeric emulsion in said coatings and paints is well known in the art as taught by the various art of record.

2. Again, with respect to applicant's assertion with respect to the activated boehmite particles, the instant invention is directed to the composition, not activating the boehmite particles asserted by applicant. Elsik et al teach employing ammonium hydroxide which inherently activates boehmite particles in the paint.

3. With respect to applicant's assertion with respect to Gernon et al, the addition of boehmite particles of Bugosh in the paints of Elsik et al would have yielded the instant properties and applicant failed to show otherwise.

With respect to the examiner's statement that a leveling score of 8 is taught for a latex compositions for said table 3 which do not contain associative thickeners, applicant asserts said compositions lack boehmite particles and the sag resistance is not taught. However, the rejection does not rely on boehmite particles in Gernon et al and Gernon et al are cited to show other properties claimed and well known facts in

paints. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant also asserts that (associative) thickeners can influence some of properties such as the viscosity and leveling, and the examiner agrees with applicant. However, Elsik et al teach compositions without associative thickeners. Furthermore, the instant claims permit other thickeners such as colloidal silica and/or non-associative thickeners which would influence the viscosity and leveling.

4. Rejection is based on the addition of boehmite particles taught by Bugosh in the paint of Elsik et al, and applicant failed to show any unexpected result.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tae H Yoon/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

THY/October 24, 2009